

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 14-29, and 33-43 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 23 being the independent claims. Claims 10-13 and 30-32 have been canceled. Claims 35-43 have been added. Claims 1-3 and 23-25, 26, and 27 have been amended.

No new matter has been added. The amendment of claims 1 and 23 is supported by the Specification at least at para. 0063, 0070, 0075, 0080 - 0087, 0092, and 0106. Claims 2, 3, 24, and 25 have been amended in order to correct the numbering of features presented therein. Claims 26 and 27 have been amended in order to correct typographical errors. New claims 35 and 40 represent material that originally appeared in claims 1 and 23 respectively. New claims 36-39 correspond to canceled claims 10-13. New claims 41-43 correspond to canceled claims 30-32.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 14-18 represent allowable subject matter. Applicants thank the Examiner for considering these claims.

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claim 1, arguing that this claim is anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,629,097 ("Keith"). Claim 1 has been amended to add features that include the following:

- selecting, by a user, of at least one object;
- organization of objects into categories selected by the user;
- selecting, by the user, and extracting at least one concept; and
- multidimensional analysis that comprises selection by the user of a subset of concepts from the at least one concept or one or more categories, the multidimensional analysis indicating when each concept in the subset of concepts, for each object or category, is present and when it is absent.

None of these features is disclosed or suggested by Keith. In particular, Keith does not disclose or suggest substantive user input to the processing described therein. This reference does not teach a user's selection of objects, or the user's organization of objects into categories. Nor does Keith teach selecting, by the user, and extracting a concept. Nor does Keith disclose multidimensional analysis that comprises selection, by the user, of a subset of concepts, where the multidimensional analysis indicates when each concept in the subset of concepts, for each object or category, is present and when it is absent. On the contrary, Keith argues that user intervention is to be avoided. The reference states that "Human intervention is generally unsupportable in real-time situations, and is very processing expensive..." (Keith, col. 14, lns. 54-56). This patent goes on to say, "What is needed, ideally, is a method which allows the items in the target data set, whatever that is, to categorize themselves based on their content. In other

words, what is needed is a means of allowing the words within the data set to self-describe their context and their interrelated associations." (*Id.*, col. 14, lns. 60-65). Keith therefore teaches away from user interaction with the processing described therein.

Given that Keith does not disclose or suggest at least the features that are listed above and added to claim 1 by amendment, Keith does not anticipate this claim as amended. For at least this reason, claim 1 as amended is patentable over this reference.

The Examiner also argues that claims 2-9, 19-22, and 33 are anticipated by Keith. These arguments are premised on the Examiner's contention that claim 1 is anticipated by Keith. As discussed above, Keith fails to disclose all features of claim 1. Because claims 2-9, 19-22, and 33 depend from claim 1, these claims necessarily include all features of claim 1. Since Keith fails to disclose all features of claim 1, Keith likewise fails to disclose all features of each of claims 2-9, 19-22, and 33. For at least this reason, none of claims 2-9, 19-22, and 33 is anticipated by Keith. Claims 2-9, 19-22, and 33 are therefore allowable.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 10-13. These claims have been canceled, rendering their rejection moot.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 23 on the same basis as the rejection of claim 1. The features of claim 23 as amended include:

- selecting, by a user, of at least one object;
- organization of objects into categories selected by the user;
- selecting, by the user, and extracting a first concept; and
- multidimensional analysis that indicates when the first concept, for each object or category, is present and when it is absent.

As discussed above, Keith teaches away from user interaction with the processing described therein. Keith does not teach a user's selection of an object, or the user's organization of objects into categories. Nor does Keith teach selecting, by the user, and extracting a first concept. Moreover, Keith does not disclose multidimensional analysis that indicates when a concept, for each object or category, is present and when the concept is present. Therefore this reference does not include every feature of claim 23 as amended. For at least these reasons, Keith does not anticipate this claim.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 24-29 and 34. The rejection of these claims is premised on the Examiner's argument that all features of claim 23 are disclosed by Keith. As discussed above, Keith fails to disclose all features of claim 23 as amended. Because all features of claim 23 are necessarily incorporated in claims 24-29 and 34, Keith fails to disclose all features of each of claims 24-29 and 34. For at least this reason, Keith does not anticipate these claims. Claims 24-29 and 34 are therefore allowable.

Objections to the Claims

The Examiner has objected to claims 14-18 as being dependent on rejected independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by the cited art and is therefore allowable. For at least this reason, claims 14-18 are also allowable.

Other Matters

Substance of the Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for allowing the applicants to interview this application on April 12, 2007.

In the interview, the Applicants discussed how the invention differed from the Keith reference. The Applicants pointed out that Keith does not disclose "multidimensional analysis" and "user input" as those terms are used in independent claims 1 and 23. The Examiner discussed his interpretation of the claim language.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox P.L.L.C.



Edward W. Yee
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,294

Date: MAY 27, 2007
1100 New York Avenue,
N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

iM# 680017